



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,193	07/31/2003	Grant E. Randall SR.	60246-225; 10,129	2187.

26096 7590 10/19/2007
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD
SUITE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

WILKENS, JANET MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10631193	7/31/03	RANDALL ET AL.	60246-225; 10,129

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD
SUITE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

Janet M.. Wilkens

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3637

20071016

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed September 20, 2007 has been entered and noted and the application has been forwarded to the Board of Appeals.

/Janet Wilkens/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3637

60,246-225
10,129

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application: Randall, et al.

Serial No.: 10/631,193

Filed: 07/31/2003

Group Art Unit: 3637

Examiner: Mai, Lanna

For: SNAP-IN PANEL DESIGN FOR A REFRIGERATION COOLER

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 20 2007

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant hereby addresses each of the arguments raised by the Examiner.

With respect to the rejection of *Montes* in view of *DeWitt*, the Examiner fails to address Applicant's argument that *DeWitt* teaches away from *Montes*. Moreover, the contention that one of ordinary skill in the art would employ multiple protruding connecting members on the same panel fails to support the contention that both of these connecting members be snap-fit connectors. Accordingly, the rejection is improper.

With respect to the art rejection of *DeWitt* in view of *Montes*, the Examiner makes two inconsistent assumptions: first, the Examiner contends that the snap fit connector of *Montes* is functionally equivalent to the connector of *DeWitt*; and second, snap-fit connectors would provide a more secure attachment. It does not make sense for the connectors to be both functionally equivalent and one type of connector be better than the

Noted
SMU
10/16/07